DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 574 SP 026 411

AUTHOR Schlechty, Phillip C.
TITLE Restructuring the Teaching Occupation--A Proposal.
INSTITUTION American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 84
GRANT NIE-G-84-0004
NOTE 58p.; Paper prepared for the American Educational Research Association Project: Research Contributions for Educational Improvement. For related documents, see ED 257 032, SP 026 402-404, and SP 026 406-411.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Satisfaction; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Welfare; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS Excellence in Education

ABSTRACT

Many of the social reasons that prompted certain people to choose teaching careers in the past, when the only options available to them were bleak in comparison, are no longer valid. Talented people who enter teaching must now do so out of a positive attraction to teaching. Unfortunately, teaching has few positive attractions and those few it does have are relatively unimportant when contrasted with the attractions of other occupations. Public education cannot overcome the relatively deprived status the occupation imposes on present and prospective members until and unless comprehensive and fundamental changes occur in the way teachers are educated, evaluated, trained, motivated, and rewarded. Such changes cannot occur in one sector of the educational establishment (e.g., teacher education) without corresponding changes in the other sectors of the educational establishment (e.g., teacher certification, teacher compensation, and systems for evaluating and rewarding teachers). This paper describes some of these conditions and suggests ways in which these might be changed. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED273574

# RESTRUCTURING THE TEACHING OCCUPATION
## A PROPOSAL

Phillip C. Schlechty
Gheens Center for Professional Development
Jefferson County Public Schools
and
University of Louisville

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Russell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper prepared for the American Educational Research Association Project: Research Contributions for Educational Improvement. November 1984

SP 026411

Those who study issues related to the quality of teaching and teachers disagree on many things, but on one point there is a growing concensus. As things now stand, public education does not have the needed incentives to: (1) attract the most capable people to the teaching profession, (2) retain the most capable practitioners, (3) improve the performance of the teachers who are less capable, and (4) better utilize outstanding teachers. (See, for example, Lortie, 1975; Vance and Schlechty, 1982; Schlechty and Vance, 1983). Furthermore, advocates of change in schools are coming to see that it is unlikely that the problems of improving the quality of teachers and teaching can be addressed on a piecemeal basis. Change in any one component associated with teacher quality (e.g., teacher education, teacher evaluation, staff development, and the incentive system) is likely to require change in other components as well.

What seems to be called for is a comprehensive approach that addresses simultaneously a variety of components associated with teacher quality. The purpose of this paper is to discuss some of the issues that must be addressed if such a comprehensive set of changes is to occur.

## The Problem

Recent studies of teachers have documented the facts that:

1) The ability of the teaching occupation to attract the more academically able college graduate is declining (Weaver, 1979; Schlechty and Vance, 1981; Vance and Schlechty, 1982; Schlechty and Vance, 1983).

2) Once in teaching, the most academically able teachers are more likely to leave the occupation than are their less academically able peers (Schlechty and Vance, 1981; Vance and Schlechty, 1982).

3) The turnover rate of beginning teachers, especially beginning teachers who are the most academically able and beginning teachers in high demand areas like math and science, is increasing (Schlechty and Vance, 1983a; 1983b).

4) The proportion of college graduates who are preparing to enter teaching has, over the past 20 years, declined dramatically. This decline has been most dramatic among white women and minority groups. These conditions have led some researchers (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1984) to the conclusion that there will be a major teacher shortage within the next decade.

Critics of the research that centers attention on standardized measures of academic ability correctly observe that there is little evidence of a direct relationship between measured academic ability and teaching effectiveness. What these critics overlook - or look past - is that though the ability to score well on tests may not predict teaching effectiveness, those who score well on tests are more likely than are low scorers to have a wide range of occupational opportunities available to them.

Many American businesses use tests to screen employees. There is, furthermore, a high correlation between most tests of verbal ability and the screening tests used by large corporations (as well as the tests used by graduate schools). Thus, persons who score well on measures of verbal ability are, by virture of their capacity to test well, provided more opportunities to do well. It should not be surprising, therefore, that while the drawing power of teaching is declining for all college students (see Darling-Hammond, 1984), those college students who have

shown the greatest tendency to reject teaching are those who test well.

Finally, even if academic ability is not demonstrably associated with teaching effectiveness, the inability of teaching to attract and retain a proportionate share of the more academically able college graduates is not a matter to be dismissed lightly. Even those who reject measures of academic ability as predictors of teaching success must acknowledge that there is, as well, no evidence to support the assertion that people who score poorly on measures of academic ability are more likely to be high performers in the classroom. Unfortunately, by far the largest proportion of those who enter teaching score below the median on most measures of academic ability and an even larger proportion of those who stay in teaching more than five years come from the lower scoring group (Schlechty and Vance, 1981; Vance and Schlechty, 1982; Weaver, 1979). Indeed, it seems likely that, if present trends continue, 50% of the college bound high school seniors who graduate in 1990 will score better on measures of academic ability than 80-90% of their teachers scored when they (the teachers) were high school seniors. Such facts may not be useful in predicting teacher success, but they do little to enhance the status of an occupation which has as a primary purpose inspiring youngsters to pursue academic excellence. And, most who study the teaching occupation agree that low status is part of the reason that many college students are rejecting teaching as a career. The question, therefore, is, "What is it about teaching that is so unattractive, and how might the occupation be changed so that it could be made more

attractive?" The remainder of this paper is addressed to this question.

The Conditions of Work

There has never been a time in American history when teaching has been, relative to other professions, an attractive alternative. For example, in 1932, Willard Waller wrote:

> Concerning the low social standing of teachers much has been written. The teacher in our culture has always been among the persons of little importance, and his place has not changed for the better in the last few decades. Fifty years or more ago it used to be argued that teachers had no standing in the community because they whipped little children, and this was undoubtedly an argument that contained some elements of truth. But flogging, and all the grosser forms of corporal punishment, have largely disappeared from the modern school, and as yet there is little indication that the social standing of the profession has been elevated. It has also been argued that the social standing of any profession is a pretty accurate mirror of its economic standing, and that, therefore, the low financial rewards of teaching are a sufficient cause of its being considered one of the less honorable pursuits. This, however, is an explanation that may not be pushed very far; it holds some truth, but there are other facts that limit it. In the smaller communities, the superintendent of schools often occupies a financial position far superior to that of most of the villagers, and yet the villagers both pity him and condescend to him (the while, perhaps, they envy him his easy means of livelihood). And it happens that the group among the teachers who are most respected in the world at large, the college and university professors, are but little better-to-do in most cases, and in some cases are much poorer, than secondary school executives, who nevertheless, except in the larger cities, have less social standing. The Lynds have a simpler sort of economic explanation, which is that there is simply no place in this commercial culture for the teacher and the professor (p. 58).

Given the historic disadvantages of teaching vis-a-vis other occupations, one must answer the question, "What is so different about teaching today and why is teaching even more unattractive than it was in the past?" One line of argument holds that the quality of life in schools and the quality of life teachers live has deteriorated badly over the past two decades. Various research reports (e.g., N.E.A., 1982) indicate that an increasing proportion of the teaching population is dissatisfied with their lot in life. Researchers attribute this distress to a wide variety of sources ranging from lack of administrative support and increasing bureaucratization to the demands imposed by the requirement to teach an increasingly diverse population of students.

These matters are real and should not be too easily dismissed. Public school environments and the conditions of the work place are or can be oppressive. It is certainly the case that public schools, like more public bureaucracies, are far behind their more progressive competitors in the private sectors when it comes to developing and implementing policies aimed at promoting and enhancing the growth and development of employees. As Levine (1984) has noted:

> "Schools have for a very long time imposed upon teachers a set of working conditions that can only be described as demoralizing and debilitating.
>
> It is one of the paradoxes of teaching that an occupation that is based on nuturing, developmental knowledge, motivation, reinforcement, incentives, and rewards should itself be so deprived of those characteristics in the organizational setting in which it functions" (p. 17).

Relative Deprivation

Acknowledging the validity of concerns regarding the conditions of the work place and acknowledging that teachers now experience pressures that may not have been experienced in the past requires one to acknowledge simultaneously that, bad though things may be, there are many ways in which the conditions of the teacher work place are better than in the past. Indeed, it is clear that teachers no longer need to feel some of the pressures they felt in the past. If one strips away nostalgia and selective memory, the good old days for teachers were not so good after all. Prior to the 1950's, for example, teachers were frequently forced to submit to personally degrading forms of social control up to and including signing contracts that required them to virtually take vows of chastity. Teachers routinely were required to make commitments to perform community service and to forego marriage (e.g., Waller, 1932). And, as Waller has noted, the teacher in the "good old days" was not immune from other authoritarian community pressures that were probably as psychologically oppressive as the most oppressive bureaucratic environment. Tenure laws and the increasing effectivenss of teacher organizations in protecting "teacher rights" have certainly done much to alter these conditions.

What is being suggested is that the problem is not that schools are less attractive than they once were. The problem is that as an occupation, teaching has never been particularly attractive, but in the past, teaching had available to it several

categories of persons who, by virture of their social status and personal values, found teaching relatively attractive when compared to the other bleak options available to them. These categories were:

1) Talented women and minorities who were precluded from pursuing more productive careers because of the effects of race and sex discrimination in the larger occupational structure.

2) Upwardly mobile men - usually first generation college students - who saw teaching as a stepping stone to higher status positions.

3) Persons whose personal values and orientation were such that they preferred working with people and ideas more than they enjoyed working in a production work setting or a profit oriented commercial enterprise.

There has been widespread commentary on the effect of the civil rights movement and the women's liberation on the supply of female and minority teachers (e.g., Schlechty and Vance, 1983; Darling-Hammond, 1984; Lanier, 1984). Therefore, I will not say more here on the subject. The important point is that a large category of persons who were once pushed into teaching by lack of opportunity are now being attracted by the magnets (Sykes, 1983) available to other employers.

With regard to teaching serving as a stepping stone for upwardly mobile men, two observations are in order. First, to the children of most college graduates, teaching is not an upwardly mobile step. Therefore, teaching can only attract persons motivated by mobility opportunities when there is an expanding proportion of the population entering and graduating from college (the condition that prevailed from 1945 to 1975).

It is this kind of condition that increases the proportion of first generation college students in the graduate pool, and thus, the number of persons who are available to "use" teaching as a mobility step. The proportion of high school seniors graduating from college is now relatively stable, if not shrinking. Second, as new jobs and occupations are created which have equivalent or superior status to teaching (as has also occurred since 1950), the entry level occupational opportunities available to upwardly mobile college graduates expands - thus, making teaching relatively less attractive. As Lortie (1975) observes: "Occupations compete for members consciously or not, and there is a largely silent struggle between occupations as individuals choose among alternative lines of work" (p. 25). One of the effects of the shift in the American economy from an industrial base to a service and knowledge work base has been to increase the competition for those persons who - in the past - might have found teaching attractive. As there are more occupations available that are relatively more appealing, the competition for able first generation college graduates is certain to become more intense. The net effect of these two conditions (the decreasing numbers of first generation college students and increasing competition for their services) is to remove yet another talent resource from teaching.

A final point is more difficult to document, though generally acknowledge as valid: the kinds of entry level occupations now available to college graduates (even in a time of economic retrenchment) are increasingly in jobs where one is expected to do the kinds of things few, other than teachers,

ministers, and professors, did in the past (i.e., work with ideas and symbols, instruct others, develop human resources and so on). These jobs - these careers - are found largely in the service and knowledge work sectors - the fastest growing sectors - of our economy. Thus, those who once entered teaching because school was one of the few places where teaching was done, now find they can teach and pursue entry into progressive careers as well.

A Summary

As the preceding discussion should suggest, I do not dismiss the argument that the conditions of the work place are critical determinants of the attractiveness of teaching to perspective teachers. Neither do I dismiss the proposition that the conditions of the work place discourage many able teachers from remaining in the occupation. What I do challenge is the assumption that the conditions of life teachers now face in qualitatively inferior to the quality of life teachers faced in some bygone era. The data simply do not support such an assertion.

Based on the data, it seems more reasonable to suggest that many of the social motives that pushed people into teaching in the past (e.g., discrimination against females and minorities) are less salient than they once were. Thus, talented people who enter teaching must now do so out of a positive attraction to teaching. Unfortunately, teaching has few positive attractors and those few it does have are relatively unimportant when contrasted with the attractors of other occupations. Even persons who value working with ideas and with people and even

persons who see themselves as nurturing and developmental can now find many equally attractive career opportunities in occupations that permit them to pursue such values while at the same time pursuing values like the need for recognition, advancement in status and career growth.

It is my view that public education cannot overcome the relatively deprived status the occupation imposes on present and prospective members until and unless comprehensive and fundamental changes occur in the way teachers are educated, evaluated, trained, motivated, and rewarded. Such changes cannot occur in one sector of the education establishment (e.g., teacher education) without corresponding changes in the other sectors of the education establishment (e.g., teacher certification, teacher comprensation, and systems for evaluating and rewarding teachers). As Dreeben (1970) wrote:

> Although there is much to be said for showing concern about the competence of teachers, the question of competence may be more fully understood in terms of the occupational characteristics of teaching rather than in terms of the curriculum of teacher training institutions...Problems of competence grow out of the relationship among schools of education, universities, and school systems; between training institutions and prevailing career patterns; and from the way these institutions shape the occupation and its members.

The remainder of this paper will describe some of these conditions and suggest ways in which these might be changed.

On the Division of Responsibility and Authority

All occupations, especially those that aspire to professional status, must attend to several important social functions if they are to be successful in establishing and maintaining themselves. Among the more important of these are knowledge generation and codification, recruitment and selection, knowledge transmission, norm enforcement, and motivation. Generally speaking, in fully developed professions these functions are unified and under the control of the occupational group (usually through professional organizations). This is not so in teaching. Rather, numerous agencies and groups and a variety of organizations struggle to control each of these functions (e.g., the AACTE claims to speak for the unified interest of teacher education, stage agencies continue to control accreditation of teacher education programs, and teachers' organizations continue to exert pressure to gain more influence among all of these groups). The result is there is considerable confusion concerning the question, "Who speaks for or is in charge of the maintenance of the teaching profession?" As Lanier puts the matter:

> The major problem that makes change and improvement exceedingly difficult in teacher education is the diffuse nature of program responsibility and accountability. Too many warring factions control various small pieces of the enterprise. Consequently, each of the participating parties is weak and no single group is powerful enough to exercise responsible leadership that might significantly change the status quo. Coalitions rarely are possible, since the various actors share little mutual interest and trust. . . The situation is analogous to the current scene in war-torn Lebanon, where numerous factions with multiple, contradictory, narrow, and self-interested concerns continue to fight and further a growing anarchy. The loser, of course, is the country as a whole. (p. 2)

The problem of reform in teaching is the fact that critical occupational functions are divided, not in how they are divided. An examination of the contemporary scene will demonstrate that this is so.

Knowledge Generation and Codification

In teacher education, as in other areas, knowledge generation and codification has been, and continues to be, a function of the university. As many educational researchers are beginning to recognize, however, if educational research is to be worthwhile to teachers, researchers much move out of the campus laboratory and into schools and classrooms. Unfortunately, the kind of research rewarded on university campuses is not always the kind of research most useful to teachers and administrators (Judge, 1982). Furthermore, those who are campus-based will, in the long run, do those things the campus rewards.

In order to overcome this reward structure, some suggest that campus-based schools and departments of education should be organized as professional schools. Such a suggestion only begs the issue. Professional schools require autonomy. The granting of autonomy is dependent on status (i.e., high status departments accrue autonomy, how status departments do not).

Within the context of university life, schools and departments tend to take on the status of the clients they serve. Thus, departments and schools that serve high status clients tend to have more status (and autonomy) than do lower status departments. Relative to physicians, lawyers, and doctoral students in academic departments (or for that matter, doctoral students in education) classroom teachers have low status. Schools and departments of education clearly suffer status loss because of their close identification with teachers. Indeed, even liberal

arts professors who teach "too many education majors" become ambivalent about the effects of this association on their status among their colleagues.

The consequence is that campus-based professional schools of education are typically low status departments within the university context and professors of education have relatively low status in the faculty status system (e.g., Lanier, 1984; Howsam, 1976; Koerner, 1963). Given this fact, it is difficult for campus-based professional schools to establish autonomous programs.

Even in those universities where professional schools of education are granted some autonomy, actions taken that are a major departure from the prevailing liberal arts mold are likely to be looked on by university administrators and liberal arts professors as evidence of intellectual inferiority and lack of rigor in the school of education. Medical schools and law schools, on the other hand, are expected to depart dramatically from the liberal arts tradition, and this departure is seen as evidence of rigor and a unique training mission.

The consequence of the low status of professors of education is not limited to the campus. Teachers, too, perceive the stigma and respond to it. Professors of education, as a group, are not held in high regard by teachers. As a consequence, teachers find it difficult to identify with teacher educators as models. Thus, the authority of campus-based teacher educators is even compromised by those whose association has cost them most dearly.

From time to time, a dynamic dean and a virtuoso performance by a heroic faculty may make it seem that a true campus-based professional school of education has been established. However, such deans and faculties are rare and the physical and psychological

toll of their activities will, in the long run, be detrimental to even the strongest among them. Thus, over time, faculty attrition and psychic fatique make the war with the established power of the university less and less attractive and the quiet solitude of the library and the campus laboratory even more appealing.

Recruitment and Selection

A second area in which the division of necessary social functions causes difficulty for education is in the area of selection and recruitment. The reasons individuals are attracted to teaching are varied (e.g., Lortie, 1975), but once one has decided to explore teaching, some predictable patterns emerge. The first point of entry into the teaching occupation is the college campus. However, only 50-70% of those who complete a certification program really enter teaching. Thus, for a large portion of those who enter teaching, the initial training requires little commitment and is largely exploratory (Lortie, 1975).

In no established profession is it assumed that initial training is an exploratory phase. In a profession, commitment to the occupation is an assumed prerequisite to entry into training. It is not so in teaching. Furthermore, in teaching, commitment to the occupation continues to be weak, even among those who seek and gain employment in teaching. For example, many teachers leave the occupation even after they have accepted the first teaching job, and many who stay indicate that they wish they did not need to (Lortie, 1975; Schlechty and Vance, 1981; N.E.A., 1982). Thus, selection to teaching is selection by attrition,

and it is too often the case that those who are left behind in the process are those least likely to develop or uphold high expectations for themselves or their colleagues.

Part of the reason this is so is that teaching is a blocked career (see Lortie, 1975). Part of the reason is that many colleges and universities seem to have a vested interest in maintaining relatively low standards for admission to teacher education (Schlechty and Vance, 1983). There is, in addition, perhaps some pressure on universities to assure politically powerful parents that their less able daughters and sons will have a place in the university where they can succeed.

Given the fact that recruitment to teaching is controlled by two or more organizations (i.e., the university and the public school and sometimes state education agencies), and given the fact that the selection criteria used by these organizations are often quite different and contradictory, it is not surprising that the system is so inefficient and dysfunctional. Clearly, some form of unity of the recruitment and selection function is called for.

Knowledge Transmission

Issues related to instruction in teacher education have probably received more attention than most other topics in the field. Without disparaging professional education courses or teacher educators, it can be observed that Waller's assertion of fifty-two years ago still is true: "Teachers still learn to teach by teaching" (Waller, 1967, p. 1). The reason this is so should be painfully obvious. The social context within which instruction occurs and the social processes by which knowledge is transmitted shapes, molds, and sometimes redirects the intended outcomes of instruction. As those who have discovered the

hidden curriculum would say, instruction can have unintended consequences. Thus, to concentrate on the knowledge and skills that are to be transmitted without attending to the social context in which instruction occurs, is likely to lead to dysfunctional outcomes.

As things now stand, teacher educators exhort students to acknowledge the link between educational theory and educational practice. In spite of these exhortations, many teachers disdain theory and find it useless (e.g., Jackson, 1986). As Waller observed:

> . . .both the theory and practice of education have suffered in the past from an over-attention to what ought to be and its correlative tendency to disregard what is. When theory is not based upon existing practice, a great hiatus appears between theory and practice, and the consequence is that the progressiveness of theory does not affect the conservatism of practice (p. 192).
>
> . . .A central point of the teacher's training. . .should be the attempt to give him insight into the nature of the social reality which is the school. This is what teachers usually learn in the hard school of experience, and by those rules of thumb which experience gives, and this is another reason for the conservatism of educational practice. Prospective teachers learn all the new educational theories while they are in school, but they must learn how to teach from horny-handed men who have been teaching a long time. But if theory is ever really to be translated into practice, theorists must learn to follow it through the social dynamics of the classroom. Only so can experience be fruitful in the understanding that will make possible a change of things that are (Waller, 1967, p. 459).

In an effort to join theory and practice, the AACTE Study Commission (Howsam, et al., 1976) and others recommend that teacher education should become more field-oriented and that professors of education should "practice what they preach, exemplify what they explicate." Such exhortations have little more than polemic value. University-based professors and public school teachers simply do not function under the same occupational conditions (Lortie, 1975). University professors are expected and required to engage in research. They are rewarded if they do so and are punished if they do not. In the typical public school, there are few rewards for doing research and no punishments for failing to engage in such activities. Five classes a day, five days a week seem quite enough to most teachers.

Even if university professors were able to "cultivate a taste for research and scholarship" in teacher trainees, as Howsman, et al., (1976, p. 107) urge, these trainees must eventually work in environments (i.e., the schools) where such activity is not valued. Such a condition can only convey to teachers the basic learning that the concept of the teacher-researcher (which Howsam, et al. suggest should be encouraged) is "fine in theory but won't work in practice."

To suggest, as the AACTE Study Commission does, (Howsam, et al., p. 107) that a college professor can teach in a way that public school teachers can reasonably be expected to emulate, implies that conditions in the college classroom are equivalent--or at least roughly comparable--to conditions in the public school. Nonsense! The problems of motivation, direction, and control are not the same with a seventh grade class and a class of students on a college campus. There are, in addition, many other fundamental differences between campus conditions and those in public schools (e.g., class

loads, time for planning, personal reflection, conferences, conversations with colleagues and so on).

If teacher educators are to serve as effective models for classroom teachers, and such models are needed, teacher educators must find ways to demonstrate their competence in classroom conditions that are recognizable and understood by the typical teacher. This cannot be accomplished unless teacher educators are placed in a position where a part of their regular assignment includes direct responsibility for the educational progress of some students in an existing school system.

The empirical research in teacher education indicates that field experiences have more lasting impact on teacher trainees than do campus-based professional courses. Thus, in a de facto sense, teacher education is already field-based. It is not clear, however, that the significance of experience in the education of teachers is a circumstance to be praised and condoned. One can learn bad practice through experience as well as good. What is needed if teaching is to become a profession based on generalizable knowledge is a social context for instructing teachers which supports the critical examination of practice in light of research and theory. There currently exists no organization that can accomplish this end to the extent that it must be accomplished, nor does it seem likely that existing organizations can be patched up to accomplish this goal.

The separation of the site of formal instruction and formal efforts at socialization (i.e., the university campus) from the site of informal instruction and socialization is commonly recognized as one of the major problems confronting teacher education. Unlike

training in law and medicine, however, where the social influences of the work place are viewed as a resource, in teacher education the social influences of the work place are seen as a problem. Recognizing that much existing practice in schools and classrooms is often antithetical to professionalism, teacher educators strive mightily to offset the effects of the real world. However, the rewards teacher educators have to offer to trainees for supporting the attitudes and values they (teacher educators) espouse, pale in significance when compared to the rewards available from the beginning teacher's administrative superiors in school and from other teachers in lunchrooms and teachers' lounges.

Norm Enforcement

There is, perhaps, no more clear example of the dysfunctional aspects of the way teacher education is currently organized than in the area of norm enforcement. Those who are officially expected to establish the standards for appropriate practice and who evaluate teacher performance (i.e., administrators) are not members of the teaching occupation. This is a controversial statement, but it is one that has considerable support among teachers. Administrators, too, are beginning to accept the fact that they and teachers serve different interests. Compounding this condition is the fact that those who are expected to transmit the norms of practice (teacher educators) typically hold different values regarding the teaching act than do administrators. For example, building administrators are necessarily concerned with the teacher's performance as an employee--as well as a professional. The teacher educator is generally concerned exclusively with the teacher's performance in an instructional setting.

There is certainly no assurance that the performance expectations of the classroom teacher as a bureaucratic employee will be the same as the expectations of the teacher as a professional (e.g., Merton, 1968). Indeed, the primary basis for evaluating teachers in many, if not most, school systems continues to be associated with an employee mentality. For example, most evaluation forms assess teachers on factors like "willingness to cooperate with administrators." Even if it is not done explicitly, implicit in any evaluation by an administrator is certain to be some assessment of these matters.

Thus, it is that many new teachers often learn that if they take seriously the ideas promulgated by their methods professors, they are likely to be evaluated negatively by their supervisors and administrators (Blackburn, 1973). It is this condition, perhaps, that leads teachers to the oft repeated statement, "It's fine in theory, but it won't work in practice." Such a condition is not likely to be overcome until those who transmit norms (teacher educators), those to whom the norms apply (teachers), and those who evaluate performance (administrators) are joined in a single agency charged with the responsibility of improving the state of the art.

Motivation and Careers

An honest appraisal of what must be done if American public schools are to attract, motivate, and retain teachers who are capable of outstanding performance in the classroom is likely to threaten almost every vested interest concerned with the preparation of teachers, the certification of teachers, the evaluation of teachers, the salaries of teachers, and public education generally. The kinds of changes that are required go beyond the piecemeal efforts to change teacher education, the development of rigorous standards for teacher evaluation, or the payment of bonuses to outstanding

teachers. More important, it calls for a long term plan with clear action steps along the way.

The first steps might be the creation of a new ladder that provides for the systematic induction of new teachers into the role of teacher, as well as for continuing career opportunities for those who demonstrate that they are capable of outstanding performance in the classroom. The plan being developed by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools provides an illustration. In this plan, the probationary period will extend from four to six years. During the first two years, intensive training and evaluation will occur. The purpose of this period is to clearly communicate performance expectations, to identify specific skill deficiencies--barriers to outstanding performance--and to provide support to overcoming weaknesses. Assuming the teacher successfully completes this evaluation and training period, he/she is designated a career candidate. During the candidacy period, the teacher undergoes continued training and extensive evaluation to determine whether he/she was in fact using the skills developed earlier in ways that are consistent with the expectations the school system has determined to be reasonable for outstanding teachers. Once there is clear evidence that these expectations are being met, the individual is awarded career level I status and tenure.

As a career level I teacher, the individual is expected to maintain outstanding performance (regular performance evaluation is conducted) and to serve as a mentor to beginning teachers. The rationale for requiring career teachers to serve as mentors has three components. First, it is assumed that persons who have demonstrated in prior performance that they are capable of outstanding performance are the most appropriate models for neophytes. Second, it is assumed that one of the best ways to maintain one's own skills is to

articulate and demonstrate that skill to others. (The medical school adage, "Watch one, do one, teach one," undergirds this assumption.) Third, by giving career teachers a formalized responsibility for teacher education, the status of teaching will be enhanced, or so it is argued.

Every three years, the evaluations of the performance of career teachers would be reviewed and summarized. Assuming that these evaluations clearly indicate that the individual has continued to meet the expectations for outstanding performance, a $2,000 salary increase is to be awarded. This process is repeated every three years throughout the teacher's career. In addition, individuals who choose to do so will be provided the opportunity to take on additional responsibilities and new job assignments in addition to classroom teaching. For example, the career structure provides for a second career level where it is expected that the teacher will be especially skilled in the diagnosis and remediation of instructional problems and will assist school faculties in designing and implementing school level instructional programs. Career level III teachers will be expected to provide leadership in curriculum evaluation and the design and implementation of training programs for new teachers and/or for other experienced teachers.

What is critical is that the plan does provide career options and increased status for teachers as well as substantial salary increases. Clearly, the implementation of a plan like the one proposed in Charlotte-Mecklenburg will cause teacher training institutions and public schools to view their roles in teacher education in substantially different ways. For example, much that is now taught in schools of education, especially in the area of

pedagogy will be taught on the job as a part of the induction/training process. Student teaching supervision will undoubtedly shift from the university-based supervisor to the school-based career teacher/mentor. (See Schlechty, et al., 1984 for a more detailed description of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Program.)

Simplifying Certification

In their report Meeting the Need for Quality Action in the South, the Southern Regional Board's Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools write, "The complexity and regidity of certification rules have not been addressed forthrightly by most states in the region" (p. 17). This condition is not unique to the South. Indeed, in a field where it is generally acknowledged that there is a dearth of knowledge, it is amazing how many specialized courses and specialized certificates state education agencies and universities have been able to generate. Though I do not agree with some liberal arts critics who suggest there is no specialized knowledge in the field of pedagogy, I do believe that overspecialization has led to the trivialization, duplication, and fragmentation of teacher training programs on many college campuses. One of the unhappy results is that able students often view education courses as intellectually vacuous. There are indeed few college campuses where the rigorous study of education is viewed as a high status task. (Judge, 1982.) It is my belief that the ability of the teaching occupation to recruit outstanding college students would be greatly enhanced if undergraduate teacher education were totally reconceptualized. Specifically, at the undergraduate level, education courses should be viewed as liberal studies and made a part of the liberal arts curricula. The clinical training of teachers should occur only after a person has received a liberal arts degree in which he/she has taken intellectually rigorous courses which

require demonstrated capacity to study education related issues. Undergraduate pre-teacher education programs should be organized more like pre-law and pre-medicine programs are organized, and the study of education and education related subjects (e.g., psychometrics) should be integral parts of such a curriculum just as chemistry and life sciences are a part of most pre-medical programs. Demonstrating that one is capable of being a serious student of education should be a prerequisite for entering school-based teacher training programs. This would enhance the status of the study of education and assure as well that those who are considering entering teaching would not be discouraged by what many perceive to be trivial academic endeavors. (A more elaborate discussion of this controversial point and the implications this recommendation has for schools of education is available in Schlechty and Vance, 1983.)

Reconceptualizing the Role of the Teacher

In a recent article, Berliner (1983) presented a convincing argument that the teaching role is an executive role and that the functions teachers carry out are executive functions. Berliner goes on to argue that by conceptualizing the role of the teacher in ways that give emphasis to these executive functions, the status of teaching would be enhanced and the livelihood that teaching could commend professional level salaries would be increased. I agree. Furthermore, I believe that by viewing the teacher as an executive rather than as a low level worker in a bureaucratic organization, many of the problems that are now confronted in evaluating teachers can be overcome. At the very least, it would provide new models and new paradigms for thinking about the evaluation of teachers. (See Schlechty and Joslin, 1984.) For example, teachers frequently argue that teaching cannot be evaluated because the effects and

effectiveness of teaching are dependent upon too many variables beyond their control. A similar argument could be made regarding the jobs of research scientists, development engineers, and first line supervisors in knowledge work organizations like IBM and AT &T. Yet, these organizations have developed ways of evaluating job performance.

Among other things, knowledge work organizations seem to view evaluation as a part of the staff development/management development process. Evaluation is a means of communicating and clarifying expectations as well as verifying the degree to which expectations are being met. Indeed, clinical supervision as advocated by persons like Cogan (1974) is very similar to the form of evaluation and staff development that occur in many high technology organizations. By viewing the teacher as a manager or executive, clinical supervision becomes a legitimate process within schools rather than simply an add-on or something external to the summative evaluation process used to determine the quality of teacher performance.

A General View

Specific proposals regarding needed action to attract and retain teachers are not likely to be effective until our collective view of teaching and the role of teachers in schools is changed. At present, teachers are viewed in too many schools as low level employees in bureaucratic organizations. A more appropriate view would start with the primise that schools are primarily concerned with motivating children to do school work. The purpose of school work is to cause children to process knowledge. Such a view elevates the role of teacher to that of an executive in a knowledge work organization. Simultaneously, it focuses the attention of the teacher on the

primary task which is to motivate, direct, instruct, and support students in ways that encourage them to do the school work.

Put differently, I believe that the most effective way for schools to develop and maintain quality is to examine the way many high technology organizations (e.g., IBM) train, lead, manage, and evaluate their work force. Schools are not factories, but they are organizations. Furthermore, the purpose of these organizations is to direct the activities of children in ways that make them effective and efficient knowledge workers. Thus, organizations that have experience in managing knowledge workers may provide instructive models for those who would reform schools to meet the conditions of the twenty-first century. (See Schlechty and Joslin, 1984).

Collaboration: A Compromised Solution

One of the more widespread and popular responses to the problems that beset teacher education and public education is the development of collaborative approaches to the governance and operation of inservice and preservice teacher education programs. There are many forms of collaboration but all have as a primary purpose the rationalization of jurisdictional disputes and/or the coordination or the sharing of the resources and facilities needed in inservice and preservice teacher education programs.

There are many good arguments for collaboration in teacher education. For example, it is hard to dispute the proposition that if teaching is to be professionalized, practitioners must have more authority over the way new members are inducted into the occupation. Collaboration is one means of providing some of the authority needed. Similarly, since the resources needed to adequately prepare teachers are under the control of several

different agencies, the quest for efficiency requires that some means of coordinating their use be devised. Collaborative governance arrangements are a means for accomplishing this end.

In spite of these and many other strong arguments for collaboration, however, I find it difficult to embrace the concept, at least as it is now being manifest in teacher education. There are a number of reasons for my lack of enthusiasm.

First, discussions of collaboration generally center on issues of goverance with relatively little attention to content. Furthermore, when content is discussed, one is left with the suspicion that what is new in the collaborative model is who will be doing what, not what will be done. In brief, collaboration seems to promise only that new actors will be on the stage. There is, however, little assurance that the script for the play will be changed.

A second reason I am not sanguine about the prospects of collaboration bringing about needed reform is that none of the organizations that are now charged with responsibility for teacher education have a central commitment to teacher education. Collaboration will not change this fact.

Institutions of higher education--where the major responsibility for teacher education now resides--give teacher education relatively low priority and certainly low status. Indeed, if one defines commitment as the willingness to allocate scarce resources (as I do) it is clear that in most institutions of higher education, teacher education is far down the scale of commitments (Lanier, 1984). Teacher education is most certainly a marginal commitment in most high prestige universities. Even teachers' colleges, which once accepted teacher education as a primary mission, have succumbed

to the pressure of the organizational world in which they exist and adapted to the more "respectable" values of the universiy. Indeed, the concept of "emerging university" seems to have been developed to rationalize the process whereby institutions of higher education that historically gave primacy to teacher education reorder their commitments, renounce their past, and join in the quest for academic status at the expense of professional relevance. For these, and many other reasons, I find it difficult to believe that institutions of higher education can or will serve as catalytic agents in bringing about change in teacher education--whether in collaboration with others or alone.

The commitment of public schools to teacher education is even more peripheral than in the commitment of institutions of higher education. For evidence to support this assertion one need look no further than the budget of public schools. Not only is the amount of money set aside for teacher education miniscule (usually less than one percent of the total school budget), teacher education is also the area of the budget most likely to be deleted in difficult budget years. Other evidence of the peripheral nature of teacher education in the priority system of public schools can be seen in the conditions under which most inservice activities are undertaken (after school and haphazardly planned) and the kinds of resources that are typically made available for the purpose of inservice. Is it reasonable to assume that collaboration will increase the amount of commitment public schools are able to make to teacher education, especially in these times of economic retrenchment? Probably not!

The extent to which teachers' organizations are committed to "education for professionalism" is at least as suspect as the commitment of local education agencies and institutions of higher education; although on the surface, teachers' organizations now seem to be much more willing to give teacher education a central place on their agenda. However, because teacher education, especially post-baccalaureate teacher education, is often directly attached to salary and promotion possibilities, there is tendency, among some teachers at least, to view the accumulation of course credit as much in monetary terms as in terms of professional improvement. (See Schlechty, Crowell, et al., 1983.) Thus, debates over the demands of inservice courses sometimes become, in fact, debates over "overtime pay."

The final reason I find collaboration a dubious solution to the problems of teacher education is that collaboration is too often based on the assumption that enlightened self-interest is an appropriate foundation upon which to build professional education programs. This assumption is mistaken.

Professionalization requires that the primary emphasis be on social benefits, rather than on the benefits that will accrue to special interest groups. Unfortunately, social benefit has had little more than polemic value in recent discussions of collaboration in teacher education. Underlying the drive toward collaboration are many motives that are clearly peculiar to the parties concerned, if not antithetical to the interest of excellence in teacher preparation. The promise of monetary support for programs and the fear that without collaboration many campus-based teacher educators will be unemployed may not be the only reason for the campus-based teacher educator's willingness to embrace collaboration. Such

factors are, however, highly motivating. One need not be a cynic to suggest that recent interest in field-based teacher education is motivated, at least in part, by the survival concerns of teacher educators.

To say the least, one is justified in asking how much of this new found interest in collaboration is motivated by the belief that the preparation of teachers will be improved, and how much is motivated by economic and status concerns now confronting schools of education throughout the country. It is certainly difficult to believe that campus-based teacher educators have been total oblivious to the success of teachers' organizations and state education agencies in wrestling control over teacher education from institutions of higher education. (See, for example, Howsam et al., 1976.) Neither are teacher educators unaware that much of the recent drive for reform in teaching has come from the legislative halls rather than the halls of academe.

The interests of school administrators and teachers' organizations in gaining control over teacher education are not, however, above suspicion. School administrators clearly find one of the more attractive features of "practitioner" control to be the potential for using this control to assure that teachers are trained in the rules of proper bureaucratic performance (e.g., punctuality, the need to fill out forms properly, and loyalty to superiors). Put bluntly, many school administrators want to exercise control over teacher education so that they can provide early indoctrination into the administrative peculiarities of the schools they run (e.g., Bowman et al., 1972).

It is also difficult to deny that the interest of teachers' organizations in the design and delivery of preservice and inservice teacher education is, at least partially, motivated by the economic and personal convenience concerns of teachers. So long as institutions of higher education retain control of teacher education and recertification, teachers are threatened with the possibility that they may be required to take campus-based courses at inconvenient times and places and at considerable financial cost. It is difficult to dismiss the possibility that, to teachers, one of the primary appeals of site-based teacher education lies in the fact that it is convenient, relatively inexpensive, and often not very demanding or rigorous.

Finally, it should be observed that there are many other parties that have interests to be served by teacher education, and not all of these interests are supportive of the professionalization of teaching. For example, chief state school officers have been especially interested in promoting collaboration. But, as Howsam, et al., (1976) rightly observe, it is not altogether clear that giving state education agencies a central role in the goverance of teacher education is in the interest of professional development in the teaching occupation. There is also reason to question the motives of other groups concerned with exercising greater control over teacher education (e.g., legislatures, and other national, state and local government agencies, community action groups). Clearly, these interests must be taken into account when developing teacher education programs, but they probably should not occupy center stage in deliberation of what these programs should be.

In sum, what I am arguing here is that collaboration places the burden of change on organizations that have many interests to serve in addition to the interests that must be served if high quality teacher education programs are to be developed and maintained. Because of the need to protect themselves, these other interests often distract attention from basic reform in teacher education. In addition, they are sometimes antagonistic to reform, mainly because basic reform in teacher education would cause resources and power to be reallocated in ways that these interests perceive as detrimental. As Clark and Marker (1975) have observed, rightly I think:

> Those who would reform teacher education by exhorting those partners (public schools, universities, etc.) to join together in a cooperative relationship do not recognize that "even paranoics have enemies." (p. 80)

Reform in Medical Education: A Potential Model

For those who would reform teacher education, the history of reform in medical education can be most instructive. As numerous medical historians have observed (Fishbain, 1947; Shyrock, 1960; Davis, 1877; Stritter, 1969), during the 19th century and as late as 1910 medicine and medical education in America was in a considerable state of disarray. The medical profession was aware of the inadequacy of its educational system (Stritter, 1969), but it seemed incapable of doing anything systematic to set matters right. As Stritter writes:

> "Many meetings were held and journal articles written during the second half of the nineteenth century, all of which seemed to have no uniform effect (on the reform of medical education) . . ." (1969, p. 10).

There were, to be sure, some serious efforts to bring about change in medical education, notably at Northwestern and at Harvard. Though both of these reform efforts, especially the one at Harvard, were praised by medical leaders and lay leaders alike, they were not uniformly well received by the medical profession and in some instances were strenuously resisted. For example, after the Harvard medical school undertook a major reform which included extension of the training period to three years and the introduction of a graded curriculum, the Association of American Medical Colleges attempted to require similar reforms of its membership. Probably in recognition of potential resistance, the leadership of the AAMC suggested a less "radical" program than that of Harvard. For example, like Harvard they advocated lengthening the term of final medical preparation from 2 years to 3 years, but unlike Harvard, they advocated for a 6 month term rather than a 9 month term. Nonetheless, as Stritter reports:

> A violent disagreement over the report ensured, which resulted in the disbandment of the AAMC, the opposition supporting the old two term curriculum.

Of even more interest than the resistence to the reform models provided by places like Harvard and Northwestern, however, were the factors that gave rise to, or supported, change within these institutions. In the case of Northwestern, the basic reason reform became possible was that several faculty members of Rush Medical College in Chicago became dissatisfied with the prevailing model of medical education (the so-called preceptorial method) and tried to bring about change. However:

> . . . Attempts at reform in their own institution were blocked by an autocratic president who feared loss of student patronage if higher standards were adopted. A small group of faculty led by Dr. Nathan S. Davis, one of the founders of the American

> Medical Association, left Rush to form a new medical school, the Medical Department of Lind University, in 1859. This school became the Chicago Medical College in 1863, and the Medical College of Northwestern University in 1870. (Stritter, 1969, pp. 15-16)

Thus, a committed and rebellious faculty, located in a way to bargain with a nearby college (i.e., Northwestern) was able to bring about some change in medical education. It is worth noting, however, that the reform they brought about, while viewed at the time as "radical" was, when viewed with hindsight, limited and piecemeal. For example, though Northwestern required a three year program, the requirement was not enforced for a considerable period of time in order to "ease the transition" (Arey, 19 , pp. 67-68).

The case of Harvard is somewhat different. Whereas at Northwestern Medical School a conservative President was the primary source of resistence to change (and in a strange sort of way a cause of change as well), at Harvard, the President, Charles W. Eliot, was a prime mover in bringing about reform. The source of resistence was the faculty. President Eliot assumed leadership at Harvard in 1869 and, immediately set on a course of action to reform the medical school. Stritter reports the events as follows:

> . . . His (Eliot's) first annual report for the year 1869-70 said:
>
> > The whole system of medical education needs thorough reformation. The course of professional instruction should be a progressive one covering three years; the Winter Session, and the Summer Session should be combined; and the student should give his attendance at lectures and recitations, at hospitals and laboratories during the whole years.

> Eliot followed this by taking the chair at a meeting of the Faculty of Medicine, a first for a Harvard president. His curriculum proposal led to controversy among the faculty, equally split between the conservatives led by Henry Bigelow, a distinguished surgeon, and the reformers led by Eliot. The conservatives believed that 'physicians were born, not made' and that inevitable reduction in student enrollment could exclude a medical genius. Eliot, however, swung the tide in favor of reform, citing an example of a recent Harvard Medical School graduate who had killed three men with overdoses of morphine: 'If this is the type of physician the school is graduating, it is high time to reform the Harvard Medical School." Bigelow made one more effort asking why changes were needed when everything at the Medical School was quiet and prosperous. Eliot then made his frequently quoted statement: 'I can tell Dr. Bigelow the reason; we have a new president.' There was evidenctly no room left for argument after that point and on April 7, 1871, the faculty adopted a completely graded course of study extending over a three-year period and based upon a nine-month academic year. (Stritter 1969, pp. 17-18)

Thus, at Harvard reform was accomplished only by strong--some would say autocratic--leadership from a man who was in many ways unusual.

In sum, it seems fair to say that what little progress there was in bringing about reform in medical education during the last half of the 19th century could be largely attributed to the idiosyncracies of individual men and the peculiarities of the institution they worked in or against. Such change is almost certain to piecemeal and is not likely to have widespread impact or applicability. Few faculties could be expected to have the courage--or the rebellious nature--of the Northwestern faculty and few college presidents could be expected to have the vision <u>and</u> the willingness to use arbitrary power that Eliot demonstrated. Yet, without these or similar conditions, the change models suggested by Northwestern and by Harvard were difficult to emulate.

In the late 19th century, however, a new model of medical education, and a new model for reform in medical education, began to take shape. This model had its initial manifestation at Johns Hopkins University in 1892 in the form of the Johns Hopkins Medical School. This school is generally pointed to as one of the most significant events in the history of American medical education. Indeed, few would dispute Shyrock's assessment that: "To Hopkins, more than any other one institution, the country is indebted after 1890 for a veritable revolution in the nature and status of the medical sciences . . . (Shyrock, 1966)." Furthermore, as Norwood (1965) has observed: "No 19th century medical school . . . broke so completely with the domestic tradition which held American medicine in its strangling grip."

Among the more unique features of Johns Hopkins Medical School was an insistence on the baccalaureate degree as a condition of admission to medical school, a heavy emphasis on research and the basic sciences, and a close association with a teaching hospital and a university. In regard to the latter (i.e., an association with a university), Stritter (1969, p. 56) writes: "it (Hopkins) was the first medical school in the United States that had been established as an integral part of a university. Prior to that time, medical schools had either been loosely affiliated with universities or were entirely independent." There are also a number of other critical facts to consider about the establishment of Johns Hopkins Medical School.

First, Johns Hopkins Medical School was established in a new university. (Johns Hopkins University was not established until 1876.) Johns Hopkins University, being the first American university based in the German tradition, represented a dramatic departure from the norms of most colleges and

universities and was, by its nature, committed to research and change. This provided a particularly fertile ground for a medical school to develop new and productive relationships with a university without being consumed by the vested interest that a long standing tradition is likely to generate.

Second, the conditions of funding for the establishment of the Johns Hopkins Medical School required that the medical school be established as a unique institution, and that the uniqueness be maintained or the money provided would revert to the estate of the donor (Miss Mary E. Garrett). Among the conditions stipulated by the funding source were: (1) women shall receive the same opportunity for a medical education as men, (2) a four-year course leading to the degree of Doctor of Medicine shall be provided; all instruction given in the school shall presuppose the knowledge at present required for matriculation in the university and the knowledge imparted in the preliminary medical course (a baccalaureate degree), and (3) full-time professors shall be recruited for their research interests.

Third, Johns Hopkins, unlike Harvard and Northwestern, was a planned innovation; it was not an evolutionary development. Johns Hopkins University included provisions for a teaching hospital and an excellent medical school in its master plan. Furthermore, because of the resources available, and the potential for innovation and change in medical education, Hopkins was able to recruit a faculty that could bring to bear the best thinking on the problems of medical education in America. As Flexner wrote:

> Its faculty was a group of young men whose training in England, France and Germany

> made them painfully aware of the wretched conditions generally obtaining in the United States . . . They welded in a new pattern the sound features of French, English and German medical education, doing, without thought of consequences, the logical, rather than the prudential thing . . . It was significant, not because there had been no outstanding figures elsewhere, but because here for the first time a small faculty embodied a sound university conception. (Flexner 1925)

Finally, within twenty years of the founding of Johns Hopkins Medical School (1910), the models of medical education the school embodied became legitimized (some would say enshrined) by the now famous Flexner report. Stritter summarizes the events leading up to the Flexner report as follows:

> In 1906 and 1907 (an AMA) council team composed of Colwell (the secretary of the council) and one other member in most instances, inspected every medical school in the United States. Ratings were given to each of the 160 schools and, although the "Council was very lenient in its markings," placed 82 in Class A (acceptable), 46 in Class B (doubtful), and 32 in Class C (unacceptable). These inspectors called attention to low standards, inadequate physical plants, meager resources, and incompetent faculties. This particular classification was not published, but each college was notified of its rating. The Council did, however, expose inferior schools by publishing, beginning in 1906, the results of their students on state licensure examinations.
>
> Resentment of the Council's criticism from sub-standard medical schools created much bad

> Council's efforts. This led the Council to seek assistance of an outside agency with prestige in the field of general education. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was concerned at that time with the entire system of higher education in North America. In medicine, it found a profession more willing than others to subject its education to outside evaluation. The Foundation was eager to cooperate with the Council. In 1908 Dr. Henry Pritchett, President of The Carnegie Foundation, agreed to sponsor a survey of medical colleges throughout the country. To avoid any claims of partiality, it was decided to make no more mention in the report of the Council than of any other source of information. It was meant to be an independent report by a disinterested party. Abraham Flexner was chosen by the Foundation to make the study. He later wrote: "The proper man to study medical education was a layman with general educational experience, not a professor in a medical school." Flexner and Colwell worked closely together to inspect all American medical schools between 1909-1910. Flexner, in his writing, made use of Colwell's cautious and tactful reports previously written for the Council. Flexner described them as "extremely diplomatic, because they were prepared by a committee of physicians about medical schools, the faculties of which consisted of their fellow physicians." Flexner, however, was "fortunately in a position to tell the truth with utmost frankness." (Stritter 1969, pp. 98-101)

What is perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Flexner report is the extent to which Flexner relied on the faculty of Johns Hopkins for his understanding of what medical education should be



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

like. Indeed, Flexner seems to have obtained most of his prior knowledge of medical education from extended discussions at Johns Hopkins (Stritter, 1969). There are those who debate whether the Flexner report "caused" reform in m edical education, or whether it simply occurred at a time when reform in medical education was nearly inevitable (see Stritter, 1969). There are few, however, who would debate the proposition that without Johns Hopkins Medical School as a model neither the Flexner report nor the course of reform in medical education would have been the same. The Johns Hopkins medical school model became the basis of most of Flexner's recommendations for how medical education should occur, and Johns Hopkins and its graduates became prime movers in the national reform movement in medical education that followed the Flexner report.

Possible Implications

Recognizing the dangers of arguing by analogy and of comparing events in one historical epoch to those of another, it is nevertheless, worthwhile to consider some of the possible implications that an understanding of reform medical education might have for reform in teacher education.

Clearly, many of the factors that stood in the way of reform in medical education between 1860 and 1900 currently stand in the way of reform in teacher education. For example, one of the greatest fears confronting medical educators was the fear of declining enrollments if standards were increased, especially given the prospect of competition from weak or inferior medical colleges. Such fears are quite as real in teachers' colleges today (especially less prestigious ones) as they were in medical schools in the late 19th century, especially given the general decline in college enrollments that now obtain. (See Schlechty and Vance, 1983.) Similarly, many who oppose reform in teacher

education do so because they believe great teachers (like Henry Bigelow's great physicians) are "born not made" and that too rigorous requirements may exclude genius.

It is also true that, like Harvard and Northwestern, some schools of education and institutions of higher education have been able to institute some changes in the education of teachers. And, like Northwestern and Harvard, the source of these changes has often been a rebellious faculty or a dynamic (autocratic?) dean or college president. It is also the case that most of these "models" have not been replicable in other schools. Indeed where attempts have been made to replicate them, the implications have generally been reshaped so that it appears that "the more things change, the more they stay the same". What is, perhaps, most striking, however, is the fact that teacher education, unlike medical education does not have a Johns Hopkins medical school to turn to even if some agency would undertake a Flexner type report which, by the way, I suspect the 1963 Conant report and the 1970 report by Silberman were intended to be. Why is this so? I think there are a number of reasons.

First, educational reformers have generally been bound by funding patterns that require that the <u>fiscal agent</u> be an established institution of higher education, or more recently public schools. (e.g., the teacher center legislation). Thus, it has been virtually impossible to break dramatically from tradition (as Johns Hopkins was able to do), for it has been necessary to comply with the norms of the sponsoring agency. For example, even in fiscal matters most funding agencies <u>require</u> that local custom be adhered to, unless of course local custom is more "liberal" than the custom of the funding agency.

Second, the pattern of funding of educational reform has been in the form of grants for specified periods of time rather than in the form or perpetual--though conditional--endowments. As the case of Johns Hopkins clearly illustrates, an endowment, properly specified, can almost force innovation and change while at the same time giving innovators and change agents sufficient security to "do the logical rather than the prudential thing."

Third, most efforts to reform teacher education have taken place within the context of existing organizations with a long tradition and well-established patterns of interaction and reward. The consequences are generally well-known. Special "projects" with special staff (sometimes referred to as "soft money faculty") are established alongside regular programs. There is usually little interaction between the regular program staff and the special staff, and after the outside revenue disappears so does the "innovation". There may be some residual effects (e.g., a new course, some new materials, a new relationship with a few school systems) but certainly no effects that are demonstrably of long-term significance (e.g., Howsam et al., 1976). If the example of Johns Hopkins medical school suggests anything, it clearly suggests the importance of establishing new programs, especially if these programs are "to break dramatically with domestic tradition", in environments where tradition is not firmly embedded and where change plans can be logically developed and systematically instituted. Johns Hopkins University was only twenty years old when the medical school was established and the medical school and the teaching hospital were a part of the plan of the university from the outset.

Fourth, few plans for reform in teacher education have included systematic attention to the central role the creation of a general and systematic knowledge appropriate to the occupation might play in the education of teachers. Though funding agencies (e.g., NIE) emphasize the need for "basic research" and the application of research to problems confronting teachers, to date little gain has been made in making this application possible. One of the reasons for this is the status and authority differential between educational researchers and teachers. Few, if any teachers, can today feel that they are peers and colleagues of researchers. Even fewer feel a sense of superiority though many feel disdain.

It can be argued that one of the unique aspects of Johns Hopkins was its affiliation with a knowledge generating university. Such an argument leads to the idea--mistaken I think--that the only way to have a high prestige professional school is to locate it in a university. The critical element in Johns Hopkins medical school was the commitment of the faculty to research and theory, not their affiliation with a university. Granted, the context of Johns Hopkins was supportive of such a commitment and thus, there was compatibility between the goals of the medical school faculty and the larger university. But, in keeping with the German concept of university, from the outset the medical school was relatively autonomous from control by other departments and schools within the university. They hired their own chemists, bacteriologists and so on. They did not depend on other areas of the university to provide them.

In sum, what the Johns Hopkins medical school suggests with regard to teacher education is the importance of research in the education of professionals, not the importance of a university affiliation.

A Proposal for Change

To develop a proposal for change in organizations, one necessarily procedes from some assumptions concerning the causes of social change. Usually, however, these assumptions are left unstated. Thus, if the change strategy fails it is seldom clear whether the failure is attributable to poorly designed strategies or to the nature of the assumptions upon which the strategies are based. I will make my assumptions clear.

From my view, fundamental change in organizations rarely occurs until some group or organization outside the target organization develops sufficient power and authority to compel the target organization to change. These groups and organizations can involve participation by present members of the target organization, but to the extent that insiders join change-oriented groups or organizations they are usually behaving, sociologically speaking as outsiders.

There are both empirical and logical bases for the assumption that change comes largely from outside the target population. Empirically, there are few, if any, cases where an organization has undergone fundamental restructuring until those in the existing power structure perceive that without change the central goals of their organization are threatened. Certainly, there have been small-scale, cosmetic changes in organizations, usually undertaken for the purpose of improving efficiency or profit, but such changes seldom threaten the more basic features of the existing power arrangements.

Logically, it seems to me to be clear that change in an organization, if it is fundamental, necessarily causes shifts in the existing power structure. Those who occupy power positions in the existing arrangements are likely to seek to preserve these arrangements, for it is in their personal interest to do so. Thus, the power available to "insiders" in an organization is more likely

to be legitimately used to maintain the system than to change it and those who use their power for change are likely to be sanctioned by those above them and those below.

Thus, to expect that the drive toward change will come from within the organization that is the target of change that is probably naive.

Given the assumptions I make about the causes of change, and the reasoning that flows from these assumptions, it should be clear that I do not see much hope that, as insiders, teacher educators, teachers or school administrators can or will bring about the changes that are needed to further the ends of professional education for teachers. What is needed is a mechanism where change-oriented teachers, teacher educators, and public school administrators can come together as outsiders (i.e., outside the present teacher education and public school establishment) and organize themselves for change. In brief, what is needed, I believe, is the creation of a new type of teacher education organization, an organization that has the ability to bring together in a single place those who fulfill the basic functions required in a professional education program (e.g., the functions of knowledge generation and codification, recruitment and selection, knowledge transmission and socialization, and norm enforcement). Furthermore, this organization must be able to command the loyalties of all who participate to the point that the non-professionally oriented interests embedded in universities, public schools and teachers' organizations are excluded from places of primacy in the decision-making structure of the new organization. What is needed, in brief, is an organization that is outside the public schools, outside the university, and outside the teachers' organizations and which has sufficient power and authority in the area of teacher education to

compel these organizations to reckon with it when matters bearing on teacher education are considered. This new organization could then become a central point in a change system which would encourage--perhaps even force--the kinds of changes in teacher education that would be required if teaching is to be professionalized. For lack of a bettern term, I will call this new organization a site-based professional school of education.

The training mission of the site-based professional school would be directed toward preparing new teachers and the continuing education of those already in the field. The primary research mission would be to describe and analyze teaching in classroom settings. Attention would, of course, be given to non-classroom instruction but it seems likely that--for the foreseeable future at least--the professional educator's primary base of operation will be a classroom of twenty-five or more children. Thus, research and theory relevant to the technology of teaching must be conducted in such settings.

The relationship between the site-based professional school and the public school system would be symbiotic--not parasitic. The professional school would be established within existing school systems, but the administrative and staff structures of the local education agency and the professional school would be distinguishable, though intermeshed (much like the relationship between the staff of a teaching hospital and the faculty of a medical school). For example, most of those on the faculty of the site-based professional school would be likely to carry out some routine functions for the local school system (e.g., teaching one or more regular classes). In carrying out these functions, the staff of the site-based professional school would be directly accountable to the administrative structure of the LEA. Similarly, many of the staff of the LEA would serve functions that are supervised by the faculty of the professional

school, and while serving these functions would be accountable to the professional school staff.

The relationship between the site-based professional school and affiliated institution(s) of higher learning would also be symbiotic. The training program developed by site-based professional schools would require some campus-based activities--especially in the liberal arts areas as in selected pre-professional education courses. (Some of the latter courses might be taken as a part of a baccalaureate program, or as a part of a master's degree program and used as one basis for selecting recruits. There is a legitimate place for the study of education in the preparation of teachers just as there is a place for the liberal arts and sciences. However, the study of education has approximately the same relationship to the professional preparation of teachers as the study of anatomy has to the preparation of physicians--or so I would argue.)

Another point of contact between the site-based professional school and colleges and universities would be in the preparation of future staff members for the site-based professional school and in the preparation of researchers. The university campus is the appropriate location for the academic preparation of educational researchers. Thus, the site-based professional school would be dependent on colleges and universities to provide appropriately prepared teacher educators and researchers. In return, the staff of the site-based professional school could work with faculty from affiliated colleges and universities to create appropriate practicum experiences for educational researchers and teacher educators and could provide a supportive environment for internships and research.

It should be emphasized, however, that the site-based professional school would not be the creature of a university or

a school of education any more than it is the creature of the teachers' organization or the local education agency. Indeed, one of the bases for university affiliation with a site-based professional school should be that the university would agree to provide an appropriate pre-professional baccalaureate program as well as offering supporting environments for the advanced preparation of needed researchers and teacher educators.

Basically, then, the function of the university with regard to the site-based professional school would be to provide appropriate pre-professional preparation in the liberal arts and in the study of education, to provide appropriate clinical courses for those being prepared to teach (much as physiology departments and anatomy departments offer courses for first-year medical students), and to offer advanced specialized preparation (e.g., doctoral programs) for teacher educators and educational researchers. Though the university would "lose control" over teacher education, the emergence of the site-based professional school of education would provide an entirely new and expanded market for the university as well as useful sites for research and experimentation.

The relationship between the site-based professional school and the local teachers' association would be similar to the relationship between the local education agency and the site-based professional school. All of the staff of the site-based professional school might be members of the local teachers' association and the local teachers' association would participate in the governance of the school (as would the local education agency and affiliated institutions of higher education). However, the teachers' association would not have dominant control over the school. It must be acknowledged that the teachers' organizations, like universities and local school administrators, have interests in teacher education that are

incompatible with professionalization as well as interests that are supportive of professionalism.

Therefore, a system of governance must be established that represents the professional interests of each of these groups or agencies and mitigates against those interests that would hinder or jeopardize professionalization. The creation of such governance structures is, admittedly, a difficult and politically sensitive task, but it must be dealt with if educational quality is to be maintained and improved.

There are many factors that must be taken into account in any plan to create a site-based professional school. Among the more critical of these are:

1. It should be acknowledged that the site-based school concept is necessarily threatening to many who are now in the teacher education "establishment." Some means must be found to reduce this threat to a level that is tolerable (i.e., a level where outright resistance to the concept will be avoided). One means available for doing this (assuming appropriate funding could be assured) is to offer local institutions of higher education an opportunity to affiliate with the site-based school with the understanding that affiliated institutions of higher education will have available to them special opportunities to (a) provide paid research leaves to professors (e.g., as visiting research scholars), (b) assign doctoral students (with pay) to conduct--or assist the site-based staff in conducting--research that is being sponsored by the site-based school, and (c) offer to contract with affiliated universities to provide appropriate pre-entry courses for promising candidates (e.g., the logic of inquiry, psychometrics).

2. The site-based professional school will be especially threatening to some building level administrators and classroom teachers, especially those building administrators who are bureaucratically-oriented and those teachers who view teaching as a "job" rather than as a professional career. There is no fool-proof means of offsetting this threat, but the site-based staff should consider ways of encouraging present building administrators and teachers to develop the skills and competencies necessary to fill the roles suggested by a differentiated career structure. Indeed, during the first several years of its existence, a site-based school might center activities on intensive inservice programs for local teachers and administrators aimed at qualifying them for such roles.

3. Changing the role structure of the school system requires that the reward structure be changed also. At a minimum it requires that those who are qualified to advance on a career ladder receive a salary commensurate with their training and skill. Though pay at the level of beginning physicians is probably unrealistic, a pay scale equivalent to that enjoyed by graduate engineers and architects does not seem out of line. In addition, generous provision for payed attendance at professional meetings and conferences should be considered along with the provision of appropriate secretarial and office support.

4. The need of the site-based professional school for considerable control over establishing criteria for admission and linking admission directly to employment prospects within the affiliated school site must be addressed directly. Clear agreements among the local school board, the teachers' association and the staff of the site-based professional school must be negotiated. To the extent possible, provisions should be made for potential attrition

(e.g., trainees who for one reason or another select to pursue careers in other school systems) as well as continued employment.

5. Realistic standards for evaluation should be established. This should begin with evidence that teachers have been effected by the program and should culminate with evidence concerning the impact of the school on student learning. However, efforts to tie measures of success immediatley to measurable student learning outcomes should be resisted, for such evaluations are likely to lead to goal displacement and to cosmetic change rather than long term systematic change.

6. Finally, planners should resist the temptation of entering this project on a piecemeal basis. The idea of a site-based professional school involves comprehensive change. Any funding pattern that promises to support a piece of the project (e.g., to support visiting research scholars, but not provide support for regular staff) should be accepted only when other components have been funded as well. The site-based professional school is an interdependent notion that requires relatively simultaneous change in a number of areas. Without such change it is likely that illusions of progress could be fostered, but it is doubtful that basic changes would occur.

A Conclusion

Obviously, I am committed to the concept of the site-based professional school. Indeed, I believe that the creation of such a school could have the same impact on the status of the teaching occupation that the establishment of Johns Hopkins University Medical School has had on medicine. For this to happen, however, it would be essential that a number of things happen. Among these are:

1. Some local school system and teacher group will need to commit themselves to taking a central role in teacher education and

develop plans to turn the school system--or at least some parts of that system--into the educational equivalent of a teaching hospital.

2. A source of long-term funding will need to be located. The funding source would also need to avoid narrow accountability measures (e.g., funding will be dependent on gains in reading scores, reduction in vandalism), and take a long run developmental view of the issues of accountability.

3. A competent and distinguished staff would need to be located and provided with time to plan. (Staff for the Johns Hopkins Medical School were employed as early as 1884, though the school did not open until 1892).

4. A means would need to be developed to protect the school and staff from the political forces that might be generated against it by various special interest groups (e.g., anti-professional teachers, conservative forces on university campuses). Some such protection could be provided by state education agencies and progressive legislatures, though in the long run the staff of the school would need to be able to develop its own political power and take an active, advocacy stance among the constituencies it must address (e.g., the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Education Association). Indeed, the strength of Johns Hopkins was in part attributable to the ability of the staff and graduates to move into power positions in the AMA.

A Final Comment

The prospects of a reform effort like the one described here depends, in large measure, on how serious policy makers are about bringing about comprehensive reform in public education. There are many forces that are likely to resist such a change and, perhaps, too few willing to support it. If the grounds for resistence are logical and rational--as opposed to self-serving and provincial--I,

like any other scholar, must entertain what my critics have to say. My primary aim in writing this article is to enrich the debate over the direction of teacher education and, perhaps, to encourage some philanthropist or philanthropic organization to rethink their priorities. In spite of the many reasons for skepticism about the prospect of reform in teacher educaton, I know that there are many who have continuing faith in the prospects of real improvement in the quality of American education. I also assume that there are those who will agree with me that the key to improved education is improvement in the art and science of teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Arey, Leslie B. Northwestern University Medical School 1859-1959. Chicago: Northwestern University, 1959.

Berlinger, D.C. "Executive Functions of Teaching," Instructor, 18-33+, September, 1982.

Blackburn, James. Evaluation and the Function of Evaluator Status. Unpublished Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1973.

Clark, D.L., and Marker, B. "The institutionalization of teacher education." In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education (74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2, pp. 53-86). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Cogan, M.L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1973.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1984.

Davis, Nathan S. Medical Education and Medical Institutions in the United States of America: 1776-1876. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1877.

Dreeben, Robert S. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1970.

Fishbein, Morris (Ed.). A History of the American Medical Association 1847-1947. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1947.

Flexner, Abraham. Medical Education: A Cooperative Study. New York: The McMillan Co., 1925.

Howsam, R.B., Corrigan, D.C., Denemark, G.W., and Nash, R.J. Educating A Profession: Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Jackson, P. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Judge, H. American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad. (A Report to the Ford Foundation). New York: Ford Foundation, 1982.

Koerner, J.D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963.

Lanier, J.E. The Future of Teacher Education: Two Papers (Occasional Paper No. 79). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1984.

Levine, Marsha. Excellence in Education: Some Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies and Schools. Paper prepared for the Committee for Economic Development, April, 1984.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Warren, MI: Free Press, 1968.

National Education Association. Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1980-81. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Norwood, William Franklin. Medical Education in the United States Before the Civil War. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944.

_____ "Critical Incidents in the Shaping of Medical Education in the United States." Journal of the American Medical Association CXCIV (November, 1965), 715-718.

Rosenholtz, Susan J. and Smylie, Mark A. "Teacher Compensation and Career Ladders: Policy Implications from Research." Vanderbilt University, December, 1983, unpublished paper.

Schlechty, Phillip C., Crowell, D., Whitford, B.L., and Joslin, A.W. Understanding and Managing Staff Development in an Urban School System. (Final Report, Contract 400-79-0056) Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1983.

Schlechty, Phillip C. and Joslin, Anne W. "Images of Schools," Teachers College Record, Vol. 86, No. 1 (Fall, 1984), pp. 156-170.

Schlechty, Phillip and Vance, Victor. "Do Academically Able Teachers Leave Education? The North Carolina Case," Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 106-112, 1981.

Schlechty, P. and Vance, V. "Recruitment, Selection, and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force," The Elementary School Journal, 83, 469-487, 1983a.

Schlechty, P. and Vance, V. "Institutional Responses to the Quality/Quantity Issues in Teacher Training," Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 94-101, 1983b.

Schlechty, P., Joslin, A., Leak, S., and Hanes, R. "The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Teacher Career Development Program," Educational Leadership, (forthcoming).

Skyrock, Richard H. Medicine and Society in America. New York: New York University Press, 1960.

Stritter, Frank T. The Evaluation of a Curriculum: Medical Education in Syracuse, New York, 1872-1967. Unpublished Dissertation.

Sykes, Gary. "Public Policy and the Problem of Teacher Quality: The Need for Screens and Magnets." In L. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of Teaching and Policy (pp. 97-125). New York: Longman, 1983.

Vance, Victor and Schlechty, Phillip. "The Distribution of Academic Ability in the Teaching Force: Policy Implications," Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (1), 2-27, September, 1982.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Russell and Russell, 1932 (Reissued 1961).

Weaver, W.T. "In Search of Quality: The Need for Talent in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (1), 29,32+ (1979).